

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated May 3, 2005, a typographical error in claim 4 was noted, which has been corrected. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite due to an informality therein, which also has been corrected.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under Section 112, first paragraph, because the Examiner stated the specification does not describe "a completed event report" as set forth in claims 1, 6 and 11 as amended in the Amendment filed November 8, 2004.

Additionally, claims 1-3, 6-8 and 11-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art (APA) in view of Rangarajan. Claims 4, 5, 9, 10 and 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Rangarajan, further in view of Knapp.

Applicants note with appreciation the interview courteously afforded the undersigned counsel for the Applicants on June 21, 2005, wherein the rejections under Section 112 and Section 103(a) were discussed.

As to the rejection under Section 112, first paragraph, at the interview the undersigned counsel noted that the word "completed" had been inserted in the claims to respond to the rejection based on the Sloman reference that was made by the Examiner in the August 24, 2004 Office Action. Applicants also submitted other arguments in response to that rejection. That rejection has now been withdrawn, and at the interview the undersigned counsel for the Applicants stated that Applicants would be willing to cancel the word "completed" at all locations from the claims, if this would not result in a re-institution of the rejection based on the Sloman

reference. The Examiner stated at the interview that the Examiner did not intend to re-apply a rejection based on the Sloman reference, and therefore it was agreed that the interview that the word "completed" would be cancelled from the claims at all locations. This overcomes the rejection under Section 112, first paragraph.

As to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103, at the interview counsel noted that the Examiner in the May 3, 2005 Office Action stated that the APA does not teach forwarding an event report from a first database to a second database only if the event report has been marked with an identifier, as set forth in each of the independent claims of the present application. The Examiner relied on the Rangarajan reference as providing such a teaching. The Examiner cited column 4, lines 47-67 of the Rangarajan reference for this purpose. At the interview, this passage in the Rangarajan reference was discussed, and the undersigned counsel for the Applicants noted that the items that are listed at column 4, lines 40-56 are merely components of the primary memory of the network manager 48. It is true that these components can include two storage locations, namely a runtime database 62, and an event report log 64. It is also true that the event report log 64 contains (lists) information identifying each received event report. Counsel for the Applicants noted, however, that there is no statement in this portion of the Rangarajan reference, or in any other passage of the Rangarajan reference, that states that the event report is ever stored in the runtime database. Moreover, the statement that the event report log 64 "lists information identifying each received event report" is not the same as *marking* each event report with an identifier, much less marking each event report with an identifier if a certain set of conditions has been satisfied.

This being the case, counsel for the Applicants stated that there is no teaching in the Rangarajan reference to check the event reports that are in the first database to determine whether they have been marked with an identifier, and to forward an event report from the first database to a second database only if it has been marked with such an identifier, as set forth in each of the independent claims of the present application.

The Examiner agreed that this feature of the independent claims was not disclosed or suggested in the Rangarajan reference, and suggested that this feature of the invention could be clarified in the independent claims by stating that the event report is stored in the first database. At the interview, the undersigned counsel for the Applicants agreed to amend each of the independent claims in such a manner, and therefore it was agreed that both rejections based on the Rangarajan reference would be overcome by such an amendment.

Support for the event report being stored in the first database is present in the specification as originally filed in the paragraph beginning at page 8, line 11.

Based on the agreements reached at the interview, therefore, all claims of the application are submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Upon further review of the present specification, it was noted that the clarity of the paragraph beginning at page 8, line 1 could be improved, and therefore an editorial amendment has been made to that paragraph. No new matter is added thereby.

It was also agreed at the interview that making an amendment as discussed at the interview would not raise a new issue, and therefore such an amendment would be entered at this stage of prosecution, after the final rejection.

All claims of the application are therefore submitted to be in condition for allowance, and early reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Submitted by,

Steven H. Noll

(Reg. 28,982)

SCHIFF, HARDIN LLP
CUSTOMER NO. 26574
Patent Department
6600 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312/258-5790
Attorneys for Applicants.

CH1\ 4293110.1